



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/679,509	10/07/2003	David R. Pendergraft	86769-0027	8409
30398	7590	11/29/2005	EXAMINER WALK, SAMUEL J	
ACCENTURE, LLP C/O HOGAN & HARTSON, LLP (IPGROUP) 555 13TH STREET NW, SUITE 600E WASHINGTON, DC 20004			ART UNIT 2632	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

CK

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/679,509	Applicant(s) PENDERGRAFT, DAVID R.	
	Examiner Samuel J. Walk	Art Unit 2632	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-19 and 21-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 7 and 20 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2632

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4, 6, 9-11, 13-23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Risi (US 6724304) in view of Brown (US 2004/0232054).

In reference to Claims 1-2, Risi discloses a security entrance system wherein claimed item screening device is met by x-ray, see Fig. 6; claimed personal screening device met by chamber 101 which uses an electromagnetic or other metal detector which produces an alarm signal, see Col. 8 lns 31-34 and 48-52 and Fig. 6; claimed enclosure met by temporary containment area 201 in which a personal search is performed, see Col. 8 lns 56-59 and Fig. 6. Risi does not disclose the security entrance system is transportable. However, Brown teaches of a vehicle security inspection system wherein an enclosure 10 is provided for portable inspection of vehicle and

occupants, see para. [0029] and Fig. 1. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Brown into the system of Risi so that security screening could be performed at remote locations such as border crossings, fairs, parades, political events, etc. to provide a more secure area.

In reference to Claim 3, Risi further discloses rotating door/screener 101 and doors 202, see Figs. 4 and 6.

In reference to Claim 4, Risi further shows in Fig. 6 that after the x-ray scanning, conveyors extend out from the x-ray device. One having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have readily recognized that the length of the conveyors after the x-ray scanner could be any length including the length matching with the end of containment area 201.

In reference to Claim 6, Examiner takes Official Notice that both the concept and advantages of queuing passengers/people before an entry area of a security checkpoint are well known and expected in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made because queuing people before and entry point allows for a more organized process. In addition, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the

Art Unit: 2632

art at the time the invention was made that any number of people may be grouped in a queue by the security personnel working the checkpoint to efficiently and effectively manage the movement and traffic of the people for a more organized process.

In reference to Claims 9-10, see above rejection in reference to Claims 1-2.

In reference to Claim 11, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that temporary containment area 201 is constructed using planar walls and support beams as it is a well known and accepted building practice in building free standing rooms/enclosures.

In reference to Claims 13-14, see above rejection in reference to Claim 6.

In reference to Claims 15-16, see above rejection in reference to Claims 3-4, respectively.

In reference to Claim 17, Examiner takes Official Notice that both the concept and advantages of queuing passengers/people before an entry area of a security checkpoint are well known and expected in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made because queuing people before and entry point allows for a more organized process.

Art Unit: 2632

In reference to Claim 18, Risi discloses that if no alarm is produced, door/opening B is opened so that the passenger may continue to pick up their luggage, see Fig. 6.

In reference to Claim 19, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have also readily recognized that security room/containment area would be used for any number of people as necessitated in the situation.

In reference to Claim 21, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have readily recognized that the entrance would direct people to the personal screening device, especially since it is the first step in the process of screening.

In reference to Claims 22-23, see above rejection in reference to Claims 1-2.

3. Claims 5 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Risi in view of ^{Brown}~~APAA~~ and in view of Stomski (US 6484650).

In reference to Claims 5 and 12, Risi discloses a security entrance system wherein a separate security room is used in cases where further screening is necessary. Risi does not disclose the walls are substantially transparent. However, Stomski teaches of automated security chambers for queues

TM
11-28-05

Art Unit: 2632

wherein passengers pass through chamber 50 which is constructed partially or wholly out of transparent material such as bulletproof glass or plastic combined with bulletproof framework members, see Col. 3 lns 25-41. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Stomski into the system of Risi because having a full, separate chamber with transparent walls allows security personnel to perform a more thorough inspection of the passenger and more thorough observation by security of the passenger through the transparent walls. In addition, it would have been obvious that since chamber is transparent and proximate to the conveyor/x-ray unit, the passenger would also be able to continually view their baggage.

4. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Risi in view of ^{Brown}~~APAA~~ and in view of Yukl (US 6057761).

In reference to Claim 8, Risi discloses an airport security system that screens people and items. Risi does not disclose a footpad. However, Yukl teaches of a security system and method wherein a footprint pattern 42 on platform 12 guides the placement of the subject S for optimal contraband screening.

TM
11-28-05

Art Unit: 2632

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Yukl into the system of Risi because it would aide the subject being screened in the proper placement so that screening would be performed more quickly and efficiently.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 7 and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Jenkins (US 2005/0057354) discloses a security checkpoint. Brunetti (US 6507278) discloses a ingress/egress control system. Hunt (US 2003/0213184) discloses multiple search rooms at airports.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samuel J. Walk whose telephone number is (571) 272-2960. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:00-5:30.

Art Unit: 2632

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel Wu can be reached on (571) 272-2964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SJW


Thomas J. Mullen, Jr.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2632
11-28-05